DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 327 554 TM 015 950

AUTHOR Taylor, Vivian; And Others
TITLE A Comparison of Perceptions of the Importance of MTAI Competencies between In-Service and Pre-Service Teachers.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (19th, New Orleans, LA, November 14-16, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; *Classroom Techniques; Comparative Analysis; *Education Majors; *Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Questionnaires; *Secondary School Teachers; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Education; Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instruments; *Teacher Competencies

ABSTRACT

To compare perceptions of inservice and preservice teachers toward the relative importance of competencies identified on the Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument (MTAI), a questionnaire listing the 14 generic competencies in the MTAI was distributed to 300 preservice and inservice teachers who were instructed to rank order the competencies based on the level of importance for classroom practice. Preservice teachers were junior and senior education majors from college teacher education programs. Inservice teachers were experienced teachers from three school districts. In all, 257 questionnaires were returned from 98 preservice and 159 inservice teachers. Both groups ranked the following five competencies as most important: (1) plans instruction to achieve selected objectives; (2) organizes instruction to take into account individual differences among learners; (3) communicates with learners; (4) demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching, learning and the subject being taught; and (5) helps learners develop positive self-concepts. Table 1 provides data on the demographic composition of the samples. Tables 2 through 12 show the mean rank and rank order of importance of the competencies for inservice and preservice teachers by sex, race, age, certification level, and type of degree. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED327554

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

VIVIAN TAYLOR
RICHARD MIDDLETON
LEE NAPIER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF MTAI COMPETENCIES BETWEEN IN-SERVICE AND PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS

Dr. Vivian Taylor
Dr. Richard Middleton, III
Dr. Lee Napier

Jackson State University
School of Education

PAPER PRESENTED AT THE ANNUAL
MEETING OF THE MID-SOUTH EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH ASSOCIATION IN NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

November 14, 1990

TM015950

A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF MTAI COMPETENCIES BETWEEN IN-SERVICE AND PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS

ABSTRACT

For decades, research related to pre-service teacher preparation has emphasized the importance of making teacher preparation programs reflect the experiences of actual on-the-job teaching experiences. Studies have recommended that cooperating teachers team with college methods classes, collegeS conduct classes at school sites, and university and college teacher educators teach K-12 classes.

A number of states require that graduates of teacher education programs be evaluated with an instrument during their first year of teaching. Full certification is dependent upon a successful evaluation. Mississippi and Georgia are two such states. The state of Mississippi has the authority to penalize a university if a certain percentage of its graduates fails to successfully complete the first year evaluation. As a result of this, each teacher education program intensively integrates the concepts, competencies and skills of this evaluation instrument into at least one of its courses that is required for all teacher education majors.

One of the ways a school or college of education can measure the similarity of its experiences with actual on-the-job experiences is by comparing the perceptions of pre-service teacher education majors with in-service teachers relative to the items contained on the evaluation instrument. If a School of Education finds its teacher preparation program is not in line with actual on-the-job experiences relative to teacher evaluations as perceived by pre-service and in-service teachers, it can verify its need to adjust its programs in order to make them more reflective of actual teaching experiences.

A COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF MTAI COMPETENCIES BETWEEN IN-SERVICE AND PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS

Vivian Taylor, Richard Middleton, III, and Lee Napier
Jackson State University

INTRODUCTION

During the past few years, teacher education has been facing myriad challenges. The general lack of confidence in public education and the demand for accountability has forced schools of education to identify the qualities of effective teachers and plan curricula to ensure that prospective teachers demonstrate those qualities prior to certification. A major thrust of teacher education programs, then, is to maximize the professional competencies of teachers. The pervasiveness of this goal is inherent in such reports as "A Nation at Risk" (1983), The Carnegie Report entitled "Three Thousand Futures" (1980), and "A Call For Change in Teacher Education" (1985).

Research and development in recent years has been influenced greatly by the notion of performance-based teacher education, which is the identification of "operationally defined teacher skills that are related to increased student achievement" (Heath/Nielson, 1974, p. 463). This research has prompted many states including Florida, Georgia, and Mississippi to institute performance-based teacher certification standards that require provisional teachers to demonstrate select behaviors or competencies at acceptable levels before they attain full teacher certification

As relates to training of pre-service teachers, the research emphasizes the importance of making teacher preparation programs reflect experiences of actual on-the-job teaching experiences, and recommends that cooperating teachers team with college methods classes; colleges conduct classes at school sites; and university and college teacher educators teach K-12 classes (The Holmes Report, 1986).

The state of Mississippi has adopted a performanced-based evaluation instrument which is used to assess fourteen generic teacher competencies identified from teacher effectiveness research. The instrument, Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument (MTAI), is used to evaluate graduates of teacher education programs during their first year of teaching which is referred to as the provisional year. Full certification is dependent upon a successful evaluation (MTAI, 1990).

Mississippi in fact has the authority to penalize a university if a certain percentage of its graduates fails to successfully complete the first year evaluation . As a result of this, each teacher education program intensively integrates the concepts, competencies and skills of the evaluation instrument into its courses that are required for all teacher education majors.

PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

This evaluation process has been imposed as the result of the public's belief that "colleges and universities provide teachers with educational theory and knowledge that is often at variance with professional practice" (Moore/Cooper, 1986, p.1).

The purpose of this study is to compare attitude perceptions of in-service and pre-service teachers toward the relative importance of competencies identified on the MTAI. Based on a comparison of the two groups, a school or college of education can measure the merit and similarity of its training experiences with actual on-the-job experiences.

BACKGROUND AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSISSIPPI TEACHER ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT

The Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument is essentially the same as the Georgia Teacher Assessment Instrument. The State of Georgia was the pioneer in developing an instrument to assess teacher performance through the use of an observation instrument containing competency statements derived from the literature and validated on the basis of surveys of Georgia

educators and through numerous criterion-referenced validity studies. Since the early 1980s the competency statements and skill descriptors in teacher assessment systems can be traced to either validated research studies or the consensus recommendations of educators or to both according to Houston, Haberman, and Sikula, 1990.

These authors assert that the Florida Performance Measurement System developed in the early 1980s only included behavioral indicators that had been validated in research studies on teacher effectiveness. The Georgia, Florida and Mississippi systems are based on an assumption that certain generic skills include behaviors that all teachers should be expected to demonstrate in any course and with students of any age or ability.

Further, the Georgia Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument (TPAI) has had an impact on student teaching and school district assessment programs across the country. In addition to Mississippi, the Georgia Instrument has been adopted or emulated in statewide programs in South Carolina and Texas and has been translated for use in Portugal, Spain and Taiwan. College faculty and school principals and supervisors in Kentucky, Colorado, Washington, Virgin Islands, England and Portugal have received training on the Florida Performance Measurement System. Extensive studies led to the development of the TPAI, and numerous studies of the existing instruments have been completed. A content validation study of the 1985 TPAI, completed by Capie, Howard and Cronin in 1986 supported its structure and scoring procedures.

The Handbook of Research on Teacher Education (1990) which is a project and publication of the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) reports that despite these major efforts, state agencies, colleges and school districts interested in the assessment of teaching have yet to develop a consistent way of communicating what is being learned about evaluation in one system to others who are interested or are developing their own systems.

Since the priorities of testing companies, state agencies, colleges and school districts vary greatly, there is still a lack of consistent procedures to evaluate teachers. The American

Educational Research Association and the Education Commission of the States should continue to work towards making papers presented at their meetings an integral part of the literature on teacher education (Houston, Haberman, and Sikula, 1990).

In 1976 the Georgia State Education Agency awarded a major contract to the University of Georgia to devleop the Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument. The Georgia certification model which became fully operational in 1990 requires the passage of a criterion-referenced subject matter examination and an on the job demonstration of required competencies during the first three years of teaching. The development of a state certification system based in part on successful performance in the classroom forced Georgia to address, from the beginning, the possibility of legal challenges to its system. Because some beginning teachers would ultimately be denied a certificate on the grounds that they had not demonstrated a minimum level competency, the state knew that the system would face legal challenges (Houston, Haberman, and Sikula, 1990).

In 1984 the Mississippi State Department of Education's Office of Teacher Certification requested that Dr. Bob N. Cage, Director, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Mississippi conduct a consensus validation of the sixteen competencies in the Georgia Teacher Performance Assessment Instrument for teachers in Mississippi. The results of this consensus validation showed that Mississippi teachers chosen by their principals as good teachers strongly endorsed the sixteen Georgia competencies for both beginning and career teachers (Cage, 1984).

Between 1984 and 1986, the state of Mississippi adopted fourteen of the sixteen Georgia competencies. The two competencies Mississippi did not adopt were: meets professional responsibilities; and engages in professional self development. Mississippi also adopted Georgia's procedural use of the evaluation instrument. In 1987, Mississippi required that all beginning provisional teachers be evaluated with the Georgia adopted Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument.

DESCRIPTION AND USE OF THE MISSISSIPPI TEACHER ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT (MTAI)

The beginning teacher in Mississippi is evaluated once in the fall semester and once in the spring semester by a three member team whose members have been trained and certified as MTAI evaluators. The team consists of the beginning (provisional) teacher's building principal, an external evaluator and a peer teacher. Either the external evaluator or the peer teacher must be certified to teach at the same level as the beginning teacher who is being assessed.

The complete Instrument consists of the following three sections.

1. Teacher Plans and Materials (TPM) which assesses competencies in planning instruction, selecting procedures, choosing materials to achieve and evaluate instructional objectives, and handles learning problems, needs and progresses.
2. Position Skills (PS) which focuses on classroom management, teacher's cognitive interaction with learners, organizing and presenting instruction.
3. Interpersonal Skills (IS) which assesses classroom climate or environment and a teacher's ability to communicate effectively (MTAI, 1990).

Information for rating the TPM of the teacher by the team is obtained through the examination of a ten day portfolio (a set of ten daily lesson plans) which is constructed and submitted by the beginning teacher along with a questionnaire completed by the teacher. Information for rating both the PS and the IS sections of the instrument is obtained by each team member observing the teacher during his or her classroom teaching (lesson implementation).

Each evaluator rates the teacher on each of the three sections on a scale of one to five for each indicator representing each competency. The team scores are averaged by the state certification office, and the teacher and his or her school district is informed of the results. A teacher has three years to make the minimum scores on all indicators; however, a teacher must successfully master sixty percent of the competencies within the first two evaluations (within the

first year). Teachers who do not complete sixty percent of the indicators (competencies in the first year) are assigned appropriate college or university courses along with staff development conducted by the teacher's school district. After beginning teachers have successfully cleared the MTAI, they are issued a standard Class A teaching certificate by the state of Mississippi. Teachers who do not clear the MTAI in three years are ineligible to receive a standard Class A teaching certificate in Mississippi.

METHODOLOGY

To compare perceptions of in-service and pre-service teachers toward the relative importance of competencies identified on the Mississippi Teacher Assessment Instrument (MTAI), a questionnaire listing the MTAI fourteen generic competencies (listed on pages 8 and 9) was distributed among three hundred pre-service and in-service teachers who were instructed to rank order the competencies based on level of importance for classroom practice. Among the three hundred questionnaires distributed, two hundred and fifty- seven were returned and statistically analyzed.

Subjects included 98 pre-service and 159 in-service teachers. The pre-service teachers represented junior and senior level teacher education majors from three college teacher education programs, two private and the other state supported. Each major had taken professional courses that introduced and provided training and practice on each competency identified on MTAI. These experiences were facilitated by a combination of class discussions, research activities, micro-teaching, practicums, observation and analysis of video-taped teaching episodes, and, for some, directed student teaching. In-service teachers represented three school districts, one urban and two rural area school districts. Each teacher was certified either in elementary or secondary education and had one or more years of teaching experience. Sixty-four held an undergraduate degree and 48 a graduate degree (47 did not provide degree information). Each teacher had also been evaluated by the MTAI process, and a large percentage of them were trained MTAI evaluators. All subjects participating in the study were familiar with the competencies and their application in classrooms.

RESULTS

The MTAI Perception Survey was administered and collected from 257 pre-service and in-service teachers from central Mississippi. A total of 98 (38.1%) pre-service teachers and 159 (61.9%) in-service teachers participated in the study.

Analysis of the demographic information requested on the questionnaire is presented in Table 1 on page 12. This table reflects the categorical breakdown by frequency and percentage of the sex, race, age, degree and certification level of all subjects participating in the study. The frequency and percentage of missing data is provided as well. Data analysis by specific category involved only complete data.

Participating subjects were to indicate their perception of the relative importance, within the total group, of each of the fourteen MTAI competencies by ranking the competencies from 1 (Most Important) to 14 (Least Important). These competencies include:

A. Plans instruction to achieve selected objectives.

B. Organizes instruction to take into account individual differences among learners.

C. Obtains and uses information about the needs and progress of individual learners.

D. Obtains and uses information about the effectiveness of instruction to revise it when necessary.

E. Uses instructional techniques, methods, and media related to the objectives.

F. Communicates with learners.

G. Demonstrates a repertoire of teaching methods.

H. Reinforces and encourages learner involvement in instruction.

I. Demonstrates an understanding of the school subject being taught and demonstrates its relevance.

J. Organizes time, space, materials, and equipment for instruction.

K. Demonstrates high expectations for learners' performance.

L. Demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching and learning and the subject being taught.

M. Helps learners develop positive self- concepts.

N. Manages classroom interactions.

Their responses were analyzed to obtain a mean rank for each competency which was then assigned a numerical rank from 1 to 14. These mean ranks and numerical ranks of the specific categories studied are presented in tables 2 through 10.

Spearman's Rho was computed to determine the relationship between the pre-service and in service teachers' perception of the importance of the MTAI competencies. This particular analysis revealed a correlation coefficient of .92 ($p < .001$) (See Table 11, page 23). Further analysis revealed that significant positive relationships existed between specific categories of sex, race, age, degrees and certification levels for the in-service group as well as between sex, race and declared certification level for the pre-service group. These correlations ranged from .64 to .92 (See Tables 11, and 12, pages 23 and 24).

Ranges of mean ranks for the total pre-service group, the in-service group and for specific categories of the in-service group indicate that participants may have had a difficult time in ranking the competencies. This is also supported by several written comments which indicated that both groups felt that all of the competencies were important and that it was difficult to rank them as to order of importance. The lowest range for any group was 4.64 and the highest was 8.50. However this latter group, in-service teachers over 50, included only seven teachers. The highest range with enough subjects to warrant attention was 6.74.

The evidence clearly indicates that pre-service and in-service teachers are very similar in their perceptions of the importance of the MTAI competencies. It is interesting to note, however, that both groups ranked competencies A, B, F, L, and M to be the most important and competencies D, E, G, H, K, N to be the least important. The two major differences between the

groups were that the in-service group ranked competency F (Communicates with learners) fourth while the pre-service group ranked it first. Additionally, the pre-service group ranked competency K (Demonstrates high expectations for learners' academic performance) seventh while the in-service group ranked it tenth. These same rankings were also found when the in-service males and females were compared (See Table 3, page 15). When pre-service teachers were compared by sex the major difference was for competency J (Organizes time, space, materials and equipment for instruction) which was ranked third by males and tenth by females (See Table 4,. page 16).

When in-service teachers were compared by race, Blacks ranked competency E (Using instructional techniques, methods, and media related to the objectives) as much more important (5.5) than whites (11.5). Similar difference also held true for competency G (Demonstrates a repertoire of teaching methods). However, whites rated competencies J and K more important than Blacks (See Table 5, page 17). When pre-service teachers were compared by race, Blacks placed more importance on competencies C (Obtains and uses information about the needs and progress of individual learners), E (Uses instructional techniques, methods, media related to the objectives) and J (Organizes time, space, materials, and equipment for instruction). White pre-service teachers placed more importance on competency M (Helps learners develop positive self-concepts) (See Table 6, page 18).

When in-service teachers were compared by age groups some interesting differences appeared. The age group 20-30 ranked competency M (Helps learners develop positive self-concepts) first while the age group 31-40 ranked it seventh. The age group 41-50 ranked competency B (Organizes instruction to take into account individual differenes among learners) first and the age group 41-50 ranked it third while the youngest group, 20-30 ranked it eighth and the 50+ age group ranked it seventh. The age group 20-30 ranked competency M (Helps learners develop positive self-concepts) first while the 31-40 age group ranked it seventh. The oldest

group, 50+, placed more importance on competency I (Demonstrates an understanding of the school subject being taught and demonstrates its relevance) than did any of the other three groups (See Table 7, page 19).

When in-service teachers were compared by certification levels secondary teachers placed more importance on competency I (Demonstrates an understanding of the school subject being taught and demonstrates its relevance) by ranking it first while elementary teachers ranked it seventh. Elementary teachers placed more importance on competency M (Helps learners develop positive self-concepts) which they ranked third while secondary teachers gave a rank of eight to that competency (See Table 8, page 20). When pre-service teachers were compared by declared certification level the major differences occurred when elementary majors gave a rank of two to competency B (Organizes instruction to take into account individual differences among learners) while the secondary majors gave it a rank of eight. Secondary teachers placed more importance on competency K (Demonstrates high expectations for learners' performance), which ranked seventh, than did elementary majors as they gave it a rank of eleven (See Table 9, page 21).

Little difference appeared in the rankings of the competencies between in-service teachers with undergraduate and graduate degrees (See Table 10, page 22).

Table 1

Demographic Make-up of the In-service (N = 159) and Pre-service (N = 98) Teachers Participating in the Study

		In-service		Pre-service	
Variables	Categories	N	%	N	%
Sex	Male	26	16.4	13	13.3
	Female	125	78.6	85	86.7
	Missing	8	5.0	0	0
	Total	159		98	
Race	Black	54	34.0	32	32.7
	White	93	58.5	64	65.3
	Missing	12	7.5	2	2.0
	Total	159		98	
Age	20 - 30	23	14.5	73	74.5
	31 - 40	34	21.4	12	12.2
	41 - 50	37	23.3	4	4.1
	50+	7	4.4	1	1.0
	Missing	58	36.4	8	8.2
	Total	159		98	
Degree	Bachelors	64	40.3	-	-
	Masters	45	28.3	-	-
	Specialist	3	.6	-	-
	Missing	47	30.8		
	Total	159			

Table 1--Cont'd

Certification	Elementary	75	47.2	50	51.0
	Secondary	63	39.6	25	25.5
	Missing	21	13.2	23	23.5
	Total	138		75	

Table 2

Mean Rank and Rank Order of the Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies as Perceived by Pre-service and In-service Teachers

Competency	Total Mean Rank	Rank	Pre-service Mean Rank	Rank	In-service Mean Rank	Rank
A	5.02	1	5.33	2	4.82	1
B	5.75	3	5.58	3	5.85	2.5
C	7.26	8	6.73	7	7.58	9
D	9.13	12	9.47	12	8.92	12
E	8.11	10	8.14	11	8.08	10
F	5.21	2	3.97	1	5.99	4
G	9.52	13	9.81	13	9.33	13
H	7.33	9	7.36	8	7.34	8
I	6.17	5	6.68	6	5.85	2.5
J	8.35	11	7.61	9	8.78	11
K	7.24	7	7.74	10	6.96	7
L	6.13	4	6.09	4	6.18	5
M	6.63	6	6.32	5	6.85	6
N	9.84	14	10.00	14	9.75	14
RANGE	4.82		6.03		4.94	

Table 3

Mean Rank and Rank Order of the Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies as Perceived by In-service Teachers by Sex

Competency	In-Service Males Mean Rank	Rank	In-Service Females Mean Rank	Rank
A	3.96	1	4.85	1
B	6.50	5	5.76	2
C	8.60	11	7.48	9
D	9.19	12	8.94	12
E	7.85	8	8.16	10
F	5.46	2	6.09	5
G	10.58	14	9.13	13
H	8.35	10	7.20	8
I	5.65	3	5.89	3
J	8.15	9	8.83	11
K	6.13	4	7.03	7
L	6.54	6	6.03	4
M	7.19	7	6.75	6
N	10.24	13	9.59	14
RANGE	6.62		4.74	

Table 4

Mean Rank and Rank Order of the Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies as Perceived by Pre-service Teachers by Sex

Competency	Pre-service Males Mean Rank	Rank	Pre-service Females Mean Rank	Rank
A	4.69	1.5	5.43	2
B	5.46	4	5.60	3
C	7.31	8.5	6.64	7
D	9.69	13	9.44	12
E	7.46	10	8.25	11
F	4.69	1.5	3.86	1
G	11.31	14	9.58	13
H	7.67	11	7.32	8
I	7.08	7	6.62	6
J	5.00	3	8.01	10
K	7.31	8.5	7.81	9
L	5.92	5	6.12	4
M	6.25	6	6.33	5
N	9.08	12	10.14	14
RANGE	6.62		6.28	

Table 5

Mean Rank and Rank Order of the Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies As Perceived by In-service Teachers by Race

Competency	In-service/White Mean Rank	Rank	In-service/Black Mean Rank	Rank
A	5.29	1	3.66	1
B	6.68	7	3.98	2
C	8.54	9	6.83	7.5
D	10.49	13	8.24	12
E	9.15	11.5	6.73	5.5
F	5.71	2	5.85	3
G	10.62	14	7.93	11
H	7.46	8	6.85	9
I	5.90	3	6.12	4
J	8.71	10	8.54	13
K	6.39	5	7.34	10
L	6.12	4	6.73	5.5
M	6.59	6	6.83	7.5
N	9.15	11.5	8.90	14
RANGE	5.33		5.24	

Table 6

Mean Rank and Rank Order of the Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies as Perceived by Pre-service Teachers by Race

Competency	Pre-service/White Mean Rank	Rank	Pre-service/Black Mean Rank	Rank
A	5.63	2	4.84	2
B	5.80	3	5.16	3
C	7.25	7	5.65	4
D	9.56	12	9.35	14
E	8.88	11	6.61	8
F	3.92	1	4.19	1
G	10.24	13	9.32	13
H	7.38	8	7.29	10
I	7.02	6	5.84	5
J	8.33	10	6.42	7
K	7.44	9	8.19	11
L	5.94	4	6.00	6
M	6.02	5	6.93	9
N	10.66	14	8.74	12
RANGE	6.74		5.16	

Table 7

Mean Rank and Rank Order of the Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies as Perceived by In-service Teachers by Age

Competency	Age 20-30 Mean Rank	Rank	Age 31-40 Mean Rank	Rank	Age 41-50 Mean Rank	Rank	Age 50+ Mean Rank	Rank
A	5.78	5	4.94	1	6.03	3	6.00	5
B	7.09	8	5.68	3	5.68	1	7.17	7
C	7.43	10	7.97	10	7.19	8	8.50	9
D	9.43	13	8.06	11	9.65	12	9.33	10.5
E	8.83	11	8.29	12	8.86	10	9.33	10.5
F	5.70	4	5.50	2	5.76	2	6.83	6
G	9.00	12	9.85	13	10.32	14	10.67	13
H	6.96	7	7.59	8	7.32	9	7.83	8
I	6.00	6	6.09	4	6.54	5.5	4.00	2
J	9.52	14	7.62	9	9.08	11	10.83	14
K	4.83	2	6.47	6	6.54	5.5	5.67	4
L	4.87	3	6.24	5	6.84	7	2.33	1
M	4.65	1	7.47	7	6.30	4	5.17	3
N	7.26	9	10.38	14	10.17	13	10.33	12
RANGE	4.87		5.44		4.64		8.50	

Table 8

Mean Rank and Rank Order of the Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies as Perceived by In-service Teachers by Certification Level

Competency	In-service/Elementary Mean Rank	Rank	In-service/Secondary Mean Rank	Rank
A	4.70	1	5.42	2
B	5.63	2	6.44	5
C	7.26	9	8.08	9
D	9.23	13	8.82	12
E	8.23	10	8.45	10
F	6.01	4	5.76	3
G	8.89	11	10.21	14
H	7.24	8	7.81	7
I	6.68	7	4.87	1
J	9.01	12	8.68	11
K	6.12	6	7.18	6
L	6.09	5	5.90	4
M	5.75	3	7.90	8
N	9.39	14	10.13	13
RANGE	4.69		5.34	

Table 9

Mean Rank and Rank Order of the Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies as Perceived by Pre-service Teachers by Declared Certification Level

Competency	Pre-service/Elementary Mean Rank	Rank	Pre-service/Secondary Mean Rank	Rank
A	5.34	3	5.92	3.5
B	4.84	2	6.96	8
C	6.88	7	7.28	9
D	9.08	12	10.76	14
E	8.02	10	8.80	11
F	4.10	1	4.12	1
G	9.86	13	9.64	12
H	7.44	8	6.54	6
I	6.74	6	5.92	3.5
J	7.98	9	7.84	10
K	8.30	11	6.56	7
L	6.00	5	5.08	2
M	5.92	4	6.48	5
N	9.94	14	9.88	13
RANGE	5.84		6.64	

Table 10

Mean Rank and Rank Order of the Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies as Perceived by In-service Teachers by Type of Degree

Competency	In-service Undergraduate Degree Mean Rank	Rank	In-service Graduate Degree Mean Rank	Rank
A	5.29	1	5.47	3
B	6.68	7	5.56	5
C	8.54	9	7.11	8
D	10.49	13	8.44	10.5
E	9.15	11.5	8.44	10.5
F	5.71	2	5.47	3
G	10.62	14	9.27	13
H	7.46	8	7.42	9
I	5.90	3	5.31	1
J	8.71	10	9.22	12
K	6.39	5	6.22	6
L	6.12	4	5.47	3
M	6.59	6	6.49	7
N	9.15	11.5	10.16	14
RANGE	5.33		4.85	

Table 11

Rank Order Relationships of the Perceived Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies Between Pre-service and In-service Teachers and Within Groups By Sex, Race, Certification Level and Type of Degree

Groups Compared	Rho	Significance
In-service and Pre-service	.91	$p < .001$
Sex: In-service	.89	$p < .001$
Pre-service	.83	$p < .001$
Race: In-service	.73	$p < .01$
Pre-service	.84	$p < .001$
Certification: In-service	.81	$p < .001$
Pre-service	.83	$p < .001$
Degree Type: In-service	.92	$p < .001$

TABLE 12

Rank Order Relationships of the Perceived Importance of Fourteen MTAI Competencies Between Four Age Categories of In- service Teachers

Age Group	1	2	3	4
20 - 30	--	.64 *	.71 **	.89 ***
31 - 40		--	.91 ***	.74 **
41 - 50			--	.73 **
50+				--

* P < .05
** P < .01
*** P < .001

Bibliography

Andrews, T. and Barnes, S. (1990). Assessment of teaching. In R. W. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research in teacher education, (pp. 579-582). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Bureau of School Improvement. (1990). Mississippi teacher assessment instrument (MTAI). Mississippi State Department of Education.

Cage, B. (1984). Teacher competency survey education report, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Mississippi.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. (1980). Three thousand futures. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Heath, R. and Nielson, M. (1974). The research basis for performance-based teacher education. Review of Educational Research, 44, 463-473.

Houston, R. W., Haberman, M., and Sikula, J. (Eds). (1990). Handbook of research in teacher education. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers, East Lansing, Michigan: Holmes Group, Inc.

Moore, J. R. and Cooper, D. M. (1986). A university's response to the challenges of teacher education. Educators Forum, Houghton Mifflin, 1-15.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. (1985). A call for change in teacher education. Washington, D.C.: AACTE.

National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for education reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.